

CRIMINAL JUSTICE PARTNERSHIP
ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
May 19, 2010

Board Members Present: Chairperson Ann McKown, Secretary Gayle Harris, Public Health; Tommy Perry, Probation Designee; Lao Rubert, Member At Large; Marcia Owen, RCND; Mark Sochaski, Victim of Crime; Antoinette Hilliard, Public Defender's Office; Stephanie Felder, Member at Large; Deborah Schwartz, Member At Large

Board Members Absent: Vice Chair Kenneth Titus; Ellen Holliman, Mental Health; John Fitzpatrick, Criminal Defense Attorney; Jim Bjurstrom, Police Department Designee; Carolyn Titus, Deputy County Manager; Nina Bullock, Member At Large; Ellen Reckhow, Durham County Commissioner; Ricky Padgett, Office of the Sheriff Designee; Marcus Weeks, Member At Large; DeWarren Langley, Member At Large

Staff: Gudrun Parmer, Jo Iverson, Robin Heath, Jonie Coss, Celia Jefferson

Guests: Conrad Strader, CJPP Coordinator; Ann Oshel, DSOC; Tonya VanDeinse, DSOC;

Introductions: Chairperson Ann McKown welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. Members and guests introduced themselves.

Minutes: February 17, 2010 minutes were presented for approval. Minutes approved without corrections.

CJPP Coordinator's Report: Conrad Strader reported that the program was doing very well and he had completed the quality assurance reviews. He stated the Criminal Justice Resource Center's (CJRC) completion rate was on track with the State's completion rate of 43%. Conrad provided a budget update by reporting the Governor had asked for a State budget reduction of 1.1 million dollars. Conrad stated the Governor actually listed it as discretionary funds; however, since CJPP did not have discretionary funds, it was actually carry-over funds. He mentioned the amount of unspent funds was about 2 million for the year, but the true amount was not known until all the programs reported their final billing for the fiscal year. Conrad explained the difference in discretionary funds and carry-over funds, and stated the language needed to change to make it clearer. Gudrun Parmer asked if the total allocation for Durham would stay the same as last year. Conrad responded there was no wording in the senate bill that indicated re-adjustments; re-adjustments were normally done every three years.

CJRC Program Update: Gudrun informed the board phase I of the construction was scheduled for completion in mid June.

Gudrun announced that Project Restore would be ending and the graduation would be at Durham Technical Community College, Wednesday, May 20 at 2 pm. She invited the board to the graduation.

Gudrun reported that the County Manager would present his budget Monday, May 24. She affirmed there was a mandatory budget reduction of 3%, which amounted to \$72,784 for CJRC.

Gudrun announced a new service was added to the substance abuse treatment program. She stated the Discovery Group would be used as a holding tank for clients who were referred to CJRC and awaiting their intake appointment.

Gudrun stated CJRC received permission from the county to fill a portion of CJRC's vacancies. She announced that Robin Heath just filled a vacant case manager position, Jo Iverson was in the process of filling a substance abuse counselor, and Jonie Coss had begun to look at filling an Office Assistant position for the front desk. She also stated Pretrial made an offer to fill a vacant position they had.

Gudrun informed the board that their packet of information contained performance measures for CJRC's Community Based Correction programs, which went to the County as part of CJRC's budget request. She reported that the focus was in four areas: Substance Abuse Treatment, Employment, Housing, and Recidivism and requested the board to review the packet and submit any questions or suggestion to her.

Jo Iverson presented program numbers and an updated report of new admissions, terminations, and completions. She stated the report showed detailed data from July 1, 2009 to May 18, 2010 for all programs. Jo summarized her report by briefly highlighting on each program. The board briefly discussed the admission rate.

Gudrun provided a follow up to a discussion at the February board meeting when Rob Robinson from the Durham Center gave a presentation on new mental health services put in place by the Durham Center. She reminded members at the February meeting was much discussion around accessing mental health services for CJRC clients. She reported a follow up meeting took place and afterwards the Durham Center set aside 10 Intensive Dual Diagnosis Treatment (IDDT) slots for CJRC clients. She stated that CJRC and Treatment Accountability for Safer Communities (TASC) identified 6-8 clients who would benefit from this much-needed mental health service; however, it was not sure at this time, if this service would be available next fiscal year.

Appointment of Nominating Committee: Ann McKown stated that three people were needed for next year's slate of officers. Ann asked Gayle Harris if she would be willing to chair the Nominating Committee. Gayle Harris accepted. Ann requested two more volunteers, Marcia Owen and Debbie Schwartz both volunteered to serve on the committee.

Addressing Mental Health and Substance Abuse in the Criminal Justice System in Durham: A Study of the top 10% of Male and Female Offenders: Ann Oshel began her presentation by stating that the presentation was a highly collaborative effort between The Durham Center, System of Care, Community Correction, the Durham Police Department, the Sheriff Department, and the Criminal Justice Resource Center. Ann informed the board that a lot of data had been collected from CJRC, but was reflected in this presentation because the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) requirements prevented them from sharing individual names which was how they put the presentation together.

Ann started her presentation by explaining that an earlier study was completed in January 2010, which gathered data on the top 10 repeat offenders from all five police districts and cross-referenced those names with Mental Health, Probation, and Detention Center data. The findings showed 70% had a history of Mental Health and Substance Abuse involvement, of which 40% had services within the last three years, and only 11% were currently involved in some sort of treatment. Ann stated after the previous study it was determined that there was more information needed, so the following questions were asked: Were there gender differences in crimes committed and MH/SA involvement, were there patterns of episodic vs. continuous engagement in treatment at the time of arrest, and were there opportunities for more collaboration between the criminal justice and the mental health system for high-risk groups? Therefore, they collected data from 2007-2009 from the Durham County Detention Center. There were 17,645 male and 4,711 female inmates. 349 male inmates and 104 female inmates were responsible for the top 10% of confinements, of which 100 inmates, 50 male and 50 female, were randomly selected for the study. Ann

stated when comparing gender and other demographics, more females had utilized Mental Health/Substance Abuse (MH/SA) services than males and both showed a sharp decrease in service use over time; however, there were a higher percentage of females who had episodic contact or engaged with MH/SA services compared to males. The study also looked at the inmates' history of Mental Health (MH) services and the classification of their criminal charges and found that males amassed more charges than females, 30% were felonies and 70% misdemeanors. Ann stated they also analyzed data on confinement and community supervision, determining the average jail stay for males was 128 days compared to 76 days for females, and nearly 70% of males have served time in prison compared to 38% of females. She also noted there was a higher percent of males on probation than females. Ann went on to say when analyzing data about MH/SA engagement, they realized 73% of the inmates had a history of MH/SA treatment, while 29% screened positive for MH/SA symptoms. Ann added she believed this fact was underreported because it was self-reported by the inmate, since a large majority presented with Substance Abuse (SA) symptoms and nearly 50% were dual diagnosed. Ann reported that those with MH/SA issues had a higher percentage of crimes categorized as "other", such as trespassing, disorderly conduct, and urinating in public, committed a higher percentage of property charges and had a lower percentage of weapons charges compared to those without MH/SA symptoms. The conclusions of the report were that people presenting with MH/SA symptoms spend more time in jail and those with co-occurring disorders compose a significant percentage of the top 10%.

Board members discussed services for those with MH/SA issues and where clients were referred to once, they leave the jail. Ann McKown stated the Criminal Justice Partnership Program (CJPP) Advisory Board would like to be involved and asked Ann Oshel what sort of group should be put together to address the MH/SA issues facing the community. Ann Oshel answered they would like to see a small group of people to offer some suggestions on what to do and make recommendations for a strategic plan. Gudrun stated at the last Crime Cabinet meeting Commissioner Reckhow suggested forming a group to make recommendations, so she advised the Crime Cabinet that the CJPP Advisory Board was very interest in this topic and had it included in last year's Community Based Correction Plan Update. Gudrun suggested the next step would be to form a group or a subcommittee possibly with people from System of Care, the Durham Center, Local Management Entities (LME) Board, and CJPP Advisory Board. She added that Commissioner Reckhow had asked that the group come back to the Crime Cabinet with some specific recommendations. There was a consensus from the board to be involved in this effort. Gudrun asked if there were any board members interested in attending the subcommittee meetings, with a first meeting to occur in June. Ann Oshel added that even though the Crime Cabinet only gave them a year, she was hopeful that the group could identify some short term and long-term action steps in less than a year.

News and Announcements: Gudrun asked if there is any news or announcements. Lao advised the board that 12 million dollars had been cut from the prison education funds that went to community colleges, with some of those funds going to jail education. Lao asked if that would affect the CJRC and or the Durham County jail in any way. Gudrun responded it would affect the jail. Gudrun stated the jail provided some GED instruction through the STARR program and the last class was in May. She also added that Durham Technical Community College was communicating with jail staff about a vocational training program, however, it would have to be self supporting, meaning the jail would need to fund it. She added that the cut would not affect the CJRC because CJRC was not considered a correctional institution.

Lao asked if Probation had changed how they supervise offenders, she had heard that this might have some negative effects on DRCs because of the designated officers. Conrad answered there would not be many changes; however, there would no longer be specialized officers under the new system. Gudrun

stated the DRC and Reentry officers were carrying vacant Electronic House Arrest (EHA) caseloads and there were a lot people coming to CJRC who were not in programs here. She added this had been discussed with Tommy Perry. Gudrun suggested that if Day Reporting Center (DRC) officers were going to have blended caseloads, they should be given some SC cases along with the DRC and Reentry cases. She believed this could potentially be good for CJRC. Gudrun thanked everyone for attending and announced the next CJPP Advisory Board Meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, August 18, 2010, 1:00 PM.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.